UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,828	03/29/2006	Corrado Moiso	05788.0446	5491

22852   7590   10/14/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
JOSHI, SURAJ M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2447	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 July 2009*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *23,25,27-33,35,37-42 and 44* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *23,25,27-33,35,37-42 and 44* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 March 2006* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicants amended Claims 23, 33, 35, and 37-42 in the amendment dated

7/24/2009.

2.   Claims 23, 25, 27-33, 35, 37-42 and 44 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

7/24/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 23, 25, 27-33, 35, 37-42, and 44

have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 23, 25, 28-32, 33, 35, 38-42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over The Parlay Group, Parlay Web Services Overview,

10/31/2002, pages 1-21,

http://web.archive.org/web/20030320124225/http://www.parlay.org/specs/ParlayWebSe

rvices-Overview1_0.pdf, ("Services Overview") in view of The Parlay Group, Parlay Web

Services Architecture Comparison, 10/31/2002, pages 1-17,

http://web.archive.org/web/20030320084322/http://www.parlay.org/specs/ParlayWebSe

rvices-ArchitectureComparison1_0.pdf, ("Architecture Comparison"), and further in view

of Grantges (WO 01/45049 A1).

With regards to Claim 23, Services Overview teaches a method for providing

access to Parlay X web services providing WSDL interfaces (i.e., Parlay X Application

Interface – Parlay X is a set of high level application interfaces defined in WSDL. The

Parlay Web Services Gateway may support Parlay X Application Interfaces, Page 11,

Section 5.4, Figure 3), said services being deployed in the domain of a

telecommunication operator, by software applications comprising the steps of: providing

a Parlay gateway permitting access to said Parlay X web services (i.e., Parlay X

Application Interface – Parlay X is a set of high level application interfaces defined in

WSDL. The Parlay Web Services Gateway may support Parlay X Application Interfaces,

Page 11, Section 5.4), said Parlay gateway comprising a Parlay framework (i.e., A

Parlay/OSA Service is provided through a Parlay/OSA Gateway, with the telecom

network behind the gateway form the viewpoint of the Application. The application

interface provided by the Gateway consists of the Parlay Framework interfaces and one

or more Service Capability Servers (SCS), Page 9, Section 5.3), wherein said Parlay

gateway is included in one or more servers deployed in the domain of the

telecommunication operator (i.e., A Parlay/OSA Service is provided through a

Parlay/OSA Gateway, with the telecom network behind the gateway…, Page 9, Section

5.3); providing a set of modules comprising service interfaces for said software

applications, the modules in said set acting as proxies in order to perform requests for

access to web services on the framework of said Parlay gateway on behalf of said

software applications (i.e., Parlay Web Services Gateway – an intermediary between

the Parlay Application Server and Parlay/OSA Gateway or other network element,

providing a proxy function for the Parlay/OSA Framework capabilities that enable Web

Services solutions to be deployed using intermediate servers, Page 11, Section 5.4),

wherein the modules are included in at least one of the one or more servers deployed in

the domain of the telecommunication operator (i.e., A Parlay/OSA Service is provided

through a Parlay/OSA Gateway, with the telecom network behind the gateway…, Page

9, Section 5.3). Services Overview does not explicitly disclose software applications

deployed in third party administrative domains. However, Architecture Comparison

does teach disclose software applications deployed in third party administrative

domains (i.e., Applications, which access via Parlay the service interfaces provided by a

network operator; the could be deployed in 3rd party administrative domains, Page 6,

Section 11) in order to enable application developers to access telecom network

capabilities through an open interface (Page 6, Section 4). Therefore, based on

Services Overview in view of Architecture Comparison, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the

teaching of Architecture Comparison to the system of Services Overview in order to

enable application developers to access telecom network capabilities through an open interface. Services Overview and Architecture do not explicitly disclose configuring the modules in said set for performing authentication, authorization, and execution requests on behalf of said software applications. Grantges does teach configuring the modules in said set for performing authentication, authorization, and execution requests on behalf of said software applications (i.e., the user-selected X.509 digital certificate is then sent to proxy server 34…If authenticated at this level, proxy server then sends the information…, Page 7, Lines 9-25; Thus authentication is not conducted directly by the application, but by a proxy server (PXWS)) in order to provide a secure gateway for providing access from a client computer to one of a plurality of destination servers (Page 1, Lines 10-14). Therefore based on Services Overview in view of Architecture, and further in view of Grantges, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teach of Grantges to the system of Services Overview and Architecture Comparison in order to provide a secure gateway for providing access from a client computer to one of a plurality of destination servers.

With regards to Claim 25, Services Overview teaches the above disclosed subject matter. However, Services Overview does not explicitly disclose the step of providing a further set of modules configured for implementing the behavior of said web services once said requests on said Parlay framework of said Parlay gateway have been performed on behalf of said software applications by the modules in said set. Architecture Comparison teaches the step of providing a further set of modules

configured for implementing the behavior of said web services once said requests on

said Parlay framework of said Parlay gateway have been performed on behalf of said

software applications by the modules in said set (i.e., Finally, the agreed parameters are

signed, and the Framework returns to the Application the references to the requested

Services. These are valid only for a single session of the Application. In addition, the

associated behavior could be specialized according to the negotiated parameters, Page

7, Section 4) in order to enable application developers to access telecom network

capabilities through an open interface. Therefore, based on Services Overview in view

of Architecture Comparison, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Architecture

Comparison to the system of Services Overview in order to enable application

developers to access telecom network capabilities through an open interface.

With regards to Claim 28, Services Overview teach the step of providing a

distributed processing mechanism enabling said modules in said set to interact with said

Parlay framework in said Parlay gateway via said distributed processing mechanism

(i.e., i.e., In fact, a single Parlay Gateway or Parlay Web Service Gateway may support

both sets of WSDL interfaces simultaneously, or a combination of WSDL interfaces and

CORBA interfaces (or other interface) simultaneously, Page 20, Section 9.1)

With regards to Claim 29, Services Overview teach that said distributed

processing mechanism is CORBA (i.e., In fact, a single Parlay Gateway or Parlay Web

Service Gateway may support both sets of WSDL interfaces simultaneously, or a

combination of WSDL interfaces and CORBA interfaces (or other interface)

simultaneously, Page 20, Section 9.1).

With regards to Claim 30, Services Overview teach the step of providing a

respective distributed processing mechanism enabling said modules in said further set

to interact with said Parlay framework in said Parlay gateway via said respective

distributed processing mechanism (i.e., i.e., In fact, a single Parlay Gateway or Parlay

Web Service Gateway may support both sets of WSDL interfaces simultaneously, or a

combination of WSDL interfaces and CORBA interfaces (or other interface)

simultaneously, Page 20, Section 9.1).

With regards to Claim 31, Services Overview teaches that said respective

distributed processing mechanism is CORBA (i.e., In fact, a single Parlay Gateway or

Parlay Web Service Gateway may support both sets of WSDL interfaces

simultaneously, or a combination of WSDL interfaces and CORBA interfaces (or other

interface) simultaneously, Page 20, Section 9.1).

With regards to Claim 32, Services Overview teaches the above discussed

subject matter. However Services Overview does not explicitly disclose that the step of

one of said software applications accessing a web services comprising the steps of:

said software application subscribing a module in said further set corresponding to said

web service and configuring the service properties of said subscribed module in said

further set, wherein both said operations are performed by using the tools provided by

said Parlay framework in said Parlay gateway. Architecture Comparison teach that the

step of one of said software applications accessing a web service comprising the steps

of: said software application subscribing to a module in said further set corresponding to

said web service (i.e., In order to enable that the implementation of a Service that can

be selected and returned to an Application by the Framework function, the Service must

register itself to the Framework function (Figure 3): the Service invokes the Service

Registration API after authentication and authorization steps. When the Service is

selected by an Application, the Framework invokes the Service Factory Interface

provided by the Service, getting the Service reference to be returned to the Application,

which can then use it to access the Service, Page 8, Section 4) and configuring the

service properties of said subscribed module in said further set, wherein both said

operations are performed by using the tools provided by said Parlay framework in said

Parlay gateway (i.e., In the Parlay architecture, the Framework functions play a critical

role. The principal functions provided by a Framework are: Secure, controlled and

accountable access to the Services; Incremental introductions of new Services through

the Service registration process; Management of the integrity of the whole Parlay/OSA

system (i.e., Applications and Services), such as fault handling and load control, Page

8, Section 4) in order to enable application developers to access telecom network

capabilities through an open interface. Therefore, based on Services Overview in view

of Architecture Comparison, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Architecture Comparison

to the system of Services Overview in order to enable application developers to access

telecom network capabilities through an open interface.

The limitations of Claim 33 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 23 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 35 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 25 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 38 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 28 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 39 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 29 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 40 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 30 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 41 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 31 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of Claim 42 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 32 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regards to claim 44, Services Overview further teaches a computer readable medium encode with a computer program product loadable in the memory of at least one computer and including software portions (i.e., Services Host – the computer on which a Service is hosted. The application has no visibility to the host configuration, Page 10, Section 5.3).

7.   Claims 27, 37 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Parlay Group, Parlay Web Services Overview, 10/31/2002, pages 1-21, http://web.archive.org/web/20030320124225/http://www.parlay.org/specs/ParlayWebSe

rvices-Overview1_0.pdf, ("Services Overview") in view of The Parlay Group, Parlay Web

Services Architecture Comparison, 10/31/2002, pages 1-17,

http://web.archive.org/web/20030320084322/http://www.parlay.org/specs/ParlayWebSe

rvices-ArchitectureComparison1_0.pdf, ("Architecture Comparison"), and Grantges (WO

01/45049 A1), and further in view of The Parlay Group, Parlay Web Services

Application Deployment Infrastructure, 10/31/2002, pages 1-21,

http://web.archive.org/web/20030320112944/http://www.parlay.org/specs/ParlayWebSe

rvices-ApplicationDeploymentInfrastructure1_0.pdf, ("Application Deployment").

With regards to Claim 27, Services Overview, Architecture Deployment and

Grantges teach the above discussed subject matter. However Services Overview,

Architecture Deployment and Grantges do not explicitly disclose the step of defining at

least one web service security protocol for ensuring secure interaction between said

software applications and the modules in said set. Application Deployment

Infrastructure teaches the step of defining at least one web service security protocol for

ensuring secure interaction between said software applications and the modules in said

set (i.e., In a Web Service deployment where a Parlay Web Service Gateway is the

entity being bound to by the Parlay Application, the Parlay Web Services Gateway may

implement a Parlay Framework using the Parlay Web Services Interfaces, or it may

implement a Web security model…The security model must provide policies for both

authentication and access control, and these policies may be very strict or lax, Page 11,

Section 4.5.4) in order to provide developers with additional choices for how

applications are built and deployed, and will provide Service Providers with a broader

scope of market opportunity as they reach emerging markets that are being enabled for

Web Services (Page 6, Section 3). Therefore, based on Services Overview in view

Architecture Deployment and Grantges, and further in view of Application Deployment, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to utilize the teachings of Application Deployment to the system of Services

Overview, Architecture Deployment and Grantges in order to provide developers with

additional choices for how applications are built and deployed, and will provide Service

Providers with a broader scope of market opportunity as they reach emerging markets

that are being enabled for Web Services (Page 6, Section 3).

The limitations of Claim 37 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 27 above, and

the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regards to claim 44, Services Overview further teaches a computer

readable medium encode with a computer program product loadable in the memory of

at least one computer and including software portions (i.e., Services Host – the

computer on which a Service is hosted. The application has no visibility to the host

configuration, Page 10, Section 5.3).

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to SURAJ JOSHI whose telephone number is (571) 270-

7209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Hwang can be reached on (571) 272-4036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Suraj Joshi/
Art Unit 2447
October 8, 2009

/Joon H. Hwang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447